

the decision was made to open a new NIS Field Office in Los Angeles in 1992, Rod was the natural choice to be the first Special Agent in Charge there, as well.

In 1993, in the aftermath of the Tailhook investigation, the then-acting Secretary of the Navy disestablished the Naval Investigative Service and established the Naval Criminal Investigative Service (NCIS) in its stead. This change, and the reforms associated with it, had profound and dramatic effects across the organization.

Among other developments, in 1997 NCIS created a new Office of Special Projects, or OSP, representing the vanguard of the agency's counterespionage efforts. The following year, Rod was named the Special Agent in Charge of OSP, and set about to make his impact felt. He applied his vision and leadership to the OSP mission, ultimately evolving the unit far beyond original expectations. In addition to enjoying success in several significant espionage cases, Rod's unit applied its specialized training to a broad range of other investigative and operational activities, including counterterrorism operations, counternarcotics initiatives, and "cold case" homicide efforts. The successes achieved in these endeavors have earned OSP accolades from across the law enforcement and counterintelligence communities.

Mr. Speaker, Rod Miller has served our nation with distinction for 32 years—first in the uniform of an Air Force airman, and then in the ranks of federal law enforcement with NCIS. His is a record to be admired. I hope that the occasion of Rod's retirement from NCIS this November will give all of us pause to consider the many contributions and sacrifices of our nation's law enforcement professionals. On behalf of all Americans, I wish him "fair winds and following seas" as he pursues the next stage in his life—returning to Linton with his wife of 34 years, to join his three children and three grandchildren there—after a long, successful, and distinguished career in service to the United States of America.

THE MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2003

HON. VERNON J. EHLERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 21, 2003

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce "The Manufacturing Technology Competitiveness Act of 2003."

While Congress, the Administration and the American people have discussed the many challenges facing our nation's manufacturers, such as international trade, China policy, tax policy and health care costs, I believe that a fundamental issue has been generally left out of the debate—innovation. For decades innovation has underpinned American's dominance in the world economy. If our manufacturing sector is to remain competitive in the global marketplace, we must foster innovation within this sector.

As Chairman of the House Science Subcommittee on Environment, Technology and Standards, I oversee many of the federal government's manufacturing-focused research and development programs. I have met with

manufacturers from around the country and specifically spoken to manufacturers both large and small about their problems. They all agree that innovation is one of the keys to ensuring our manufacturers remain competitive and it is crucial to the development of new industries. Funding research and development underpins innovation.

Based on these discussions and a hearing I held earlier this year, I am proud to introduce the Manufacturing Technology and Competitiveness Act of 2003. This bill will help our nation's manufacturers maintain and improve their technological edge. This legislation will stimulate innovation through collaborative research and development, and broaden and strengthen the Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP) program, which provides small- and medium-sized manufacturers with the tools to compete better. More importantly, it will bring together a variety of partners in the public and private sectors, building relationships that encourage and foster technological development and the ability to bring these developments to the marketplace.

Our global competitors are eagerly supporting investments in manufacturing research and development because they know it is the key to sustained economic development. If we are to continue to be the world's technological leader, we need to rise to this new global challenge and make the investments envisioned by this legislation.

More specifically, the bill:

Ensures that all federal manufacturing programs and related funding are coordinated and focused on solving these important problems. The bill requires a strategic plan and improved budget process to ensure these programs work together efficiently;

Designates the current Under Secretary for Technology within the Department of Commerce, as the Under Secretary for Manufacturing and Technology, to be the federal government's point person on manufacturing R&D policy, and outlines new duties focused on fostering innovation within the manufacturing sector for this position;

Establishes a new collaborative research and development program for manufacturing technology to build partnerships among higher education institutions, businesses, states and other partners. This program will provide \$184 million over four years;

Helps to develop future leaders in manufacturing technology through a fellowship program in applied manufacturing research. Fellows will get to work with world-class leaders in technology and engineering at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (KIST). The fellowship program will provide \$7.5 million over four years;

Reauthorizes and reforms the Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP) program by increasing competition among the centers. MEP is funded at \$120 million for the first year, increasing to \$137 million by year four; and,

Creates a new competitive, peer-reviewed grant program within the Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP) program to develop new tools to help small businesses innovate and compete. Funding for this program will come from the total MEP funding.

Mr. Speaker, while I am pleased that we are on the road to economic recovery, we must still address underlying concerns about the future of U.S. manufacturing. This bill will help address some of those concerns and put our Nation's manufacturers in a better position to compete today and in the future.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House and Senate, and with the manu-

facturing and research communities, to pass this important legislation.

IN RECOGNITION OF OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUBURN, ALABAMA CITY MANAGER DOUG WATSON TO THE AUBURN COMMUNITY

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 21, 2003

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the residents of Auburn, Alabama, in recognizing the contributions of Doug Watson to the City of Auburn, Alabama.

Doug Watson has been City Manager for Auburn for 21 years. During this time, he has gained the respect of the entire community for his loyal and dedicated service. To demonstrate their appreciation, the City of Auburn, Auburn University and the Auburn Chamber of Commerce are hosting a community-wide reception on December 10, 2003. The reception will immediately follow the dedication ceremony of the Douglas J. Watson Municipal Complex, consisting of the Development Services building, the Public Safety Administration building, and the Municipal Court. The naming of this complex after Doug Watson is an indication of the high esteem in which he is held.

I salute Doug Watson for his service to the Auburn community and wish him well as he takes on the new position of tenured professor at the University of Texas at Dallas.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6, ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003

SPEECH OF

HON. W.J. (BILLY) TAUZIN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 18, 2003

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, offshore oil and gas production in the Gulf of Mexico provided nearly \$6.6 billion in royalty, bonus and rent revenues to the federal government in 2001. The coastal states which supported this production received approximately \$130 million combined—a royalty sharing rate of less than two percent. Yet onshore oil and gas production revenues on federal lands is shared 50/50 between the federal government and the state in which the production occurs. In the case of Alaska, the state gets 90 percent of these onshore revenues produced on federal lands.

The disparity between the onshore and offshore royalty sharing programs and their contribution to our domestic energy security is striking. Federal lands within the United States generated an estimated \$2 billion in royalties from the production of oil, gas and coal in 2001 with about \$1 billion of these revenues going to the states for "hosting" these energy production activities. In contrast, offshore production in Louisiana's waters of oil and gas contributed over \$5 billion in royalties to the U.S. Treasury in 2001 yet Louisiana received royalties of less than \$30 million, a 0.6% return. The Gulf of Mexico produces more energy and associated revenues to the U.S. Treasury than any other area of the federal

domain. Nearly \$130 billion has been provided to the federal government as a result of oil and gas production in the Gulf of Mexico.

States receive 100 percent of the royalties they charge and collect in state waters. Louisiana's waters extend to only three nautical miles, compared to 9 miles for Texas and Florida. Therefore, if Louisiana had waters equal to these states, the significant revenues produced in these waters would have been wholly received by the state, not the US Treasury.

Section 1412 of the Energy Policy Act of 2003, the Secure Energy Reinvestment Fund (SERF), recognizes the significant contribution coastal states provide by supporting offshore development to decrease our nation's dependence on foreign oil and gas. The SERF program shares a small portion of Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) revenues with states that host offshore oil and gas production. As included in the conference report, section 32(a) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act defines the terms used in the section, including 'coastal energy state'. It is the intention of the conferees that the Secretary of Interior (Secretary) reevaluate the eligibility of each coastal energy state's participation in the SERF program annually.

Section 32(b) provides \$35 million annually, as well as OCS royalties and bonuses above the CBO baseline (in some cases, royalties and bonuses will have to reach levels hundreds of millions or over a billion dollars above the baseline before additional revenues will be shared with coastal energy states). This subsection authorizes up to \$500 million for each Fiscal Year through 2013, and after 2013, 25 percent of qualified OCS revenues are to be shared with coastal energy states. Section 32(b) also includes a provision to protect deposits into the Land and Water Conservation Fund and Historic Preservation Fund.

Section 32(c) establishes a distribution formula comparable to those used in other federal royalty sharing programs. It also recognizes the historical contribution that some states provided by hosting offshore oil and gas production for decades, despite unfulfilled promises of royalty sharing by the federal government. The conferees have confirmed the document referred to in subsection 32(c)(2)(A)(iii). This section also provides 35 percent of a state's share directly to the political subdivisions that are within the state's coastal zone. When determining criteria for the "relative level of OCS oil and gas activities" in a state, the Secretary shall seek to direct the majority of this portion to the most impacted, or two most impacted, political subdivisions. In the case of Louisiana, the conferees have determined activities in Port Fourchon/LA1 should be recognized as OCS oil and gas activities and the conferees direct the Secretary to provide funds from the relevant portion of the formula in subsection 32(c)(2)(B)(iii) to address these impacts before any other activities in the state.

Section 32(c) specifies that only coastal energy states that have an approved plan as described under section 32(d) are eligible to receive funds. Section 32(c) also gives the Secretary authority to hold a state's funds in escrow (within the fund) if necessary and establishes a reallocation provision if states fail to have an approved plan. Finally, the section ensures coastal energy states will receive a minimum share of revenues.

Section 32(d) requires states to submit plans to the Secretary for approval. The Governor of each eligible state must include the plans prepared by the political subdivisions in the state plan. It is not the intention of this section to allow the Governor of a state to disapprove the plans of a political subdivision. In preparation of the plans, the conferees strongly urge the Secretary to ensure that states and political subdivisions carefully evaluate and coordinate with other regions. Further, states and political subdivisions should seek to use existing federal and state programs that advance the goals of the state plans. States and political subdivisions should leverage SERF resources to other federal programs to the maximum extent practicable.

Subsection 32(d)(2)(A)(v) is designed to ensure that any state with significant offshore oil and gas operations will address impacts that are "significant" or "progressive". This subsection requires that any state producing more than 25 percent of qualified OCS revenues spend not less than 30 percent of funding received annually from the SERF program (together with appropriate political subdivisions) to address "significant" or "progressive" impacts identified in the most recent EIS. For the first ten Fiscal Years of this program, the term "significant" means only infrastructure supporting "focal points of impact" (LAI) as identified in a relevant EIS. The term "progressive" means only coastal wetlands restoration. It is the conferees intent that greater than 15 percent of the funding received by the state and appropriate political subdivisions be used equally for each of these items. Further, it is the conferees intent that these monies shall be in addition to those provided to a political subdivision under subsection 32(c)(2)(B)(iii) (25 percent discretionary portion).

Section 32(e) specifies that the funds should be used in a manner that is consistent with federal environmental laws and all relevant state laws. Additionally, this section provides the eligible use of funds by states and political subdivisions. The SERF program is designed to ensure that mitigation and natural resource protection are top priorities of the eligible states. The Secretary should work with states and political subdivisions to establish reasonable administrative costs and keep these costs to a minimum. It is not the intent of this program to fund any otherwise required function of local or state government unless that function was designed to mitigate OCS activities or improve the coastal environment. Should any state propose a program or expenditure that would be authorized under subsection 32(e)(5), the Secretary shall not approve this use of funds unless there is a clear and direct link to OCS activities.

Section 32(f) requires the Secretary to withhold funding to any state or political subdivision that spent funds provided under this section in a manner inconsistent with the approved plan of such state or political subdivision.

Section 32(g) allows the Secretary to require arbitration to resolve disputes among any combination of coastal political subdivisions, states and the Secretary.

Section 32(h) provides for an administrative cost to be retained by the Minerals Management Service to implement this program. It is the intent of the conferees the Secretary will designate only the Minerals Management Service as the agency to administer and pro-

vide oversight to the SERF program. Since the majority of the coastal energy states and nearly all the federal offshore production is located in the Gulf of Mexico, the conferees expect the current Gulf of Mexico OCS Region office to play a significant role in the administration of this program.

Section 32(i) directs that two percent of the SERF fund be provided to the CREST program which has an existing relationship with the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration. This payment shall be without limit and consist of two percent of all revenues available in the fund annually. It is the intent of the conferees that the funds provided under this section be used in a manner that is largely consistent with the goals of the existing CREST MOU and the current relationship with NOAA. In addition, the consortium may perform any activity authorized in section 1412(c) of this act. It is the intent of the conferees that Nicholls State University act as the fiscal agent for this section. The conferees expect CREST to retain its primary facilities at their existing location at CCEER.

Section 32(j) requires that any expenditure by a state or political subdivision using funds provided under section 32 must be in compliance with authorized uses specified in subsection 32(e). Section 32(j) also provides that these funds may be used for any payment that is eligible under section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act. So as to create parity with other federal revenue sharing programs, it is the intent of the conferees that any funds provided under section 32 may be used for any purpose that is in an approved plan. The conferees expect the Secretary to work with other federal agencies, if appropriate, to ensure that states and coastal political subdivisions be permitted to use SERF monies in accordance with this section.

Section 32(k) requires states and political subdivisions to submit an annual joint report to the Secretary describing the expenditure of funds for the preceding fiscal year.

Section 32(l) requires that the otherwise established signs at projects or programs receiving funds under this section identify the source of revenue as being from the "Secure Energy Reinvestment Fund (SERF) program" or other common name established by the Secretary. The signage should also identify the source of funding as being from revenues generated from offshore oil and gas production.

Section 1412(b) amends section 31 of the OCSLA to reauthorize the program.

Section 1412(c) authorizes the CREST consortium through the Secretaries of Interior and Commerce. It is the intent of the conferees that the consortium will focus their work on coastal wetlands loss in the lower Mississippi River delta and adjacent estuaries. Further, as a condition of funding, the conferees expect the Secretaries to require the consortium to establish an online library of existing information and findings on coastal wetlands restoration, the interaction between the Mississippi River and Gulf of Mexico, and other similar information. The agencies should use CREST as a tool to coordinate the various coastal activities, research and development, and programs of the various federal agencies that have existing authority over coastal activities or programs that affect coastal use. It is not the intent of the conferees that, as a condition of funding, the Secretary or Secretaries require the consortium to conduct operations

outside the region in which it currently operates.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6,
ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003

SPEECH OF

HON. MAX SANDLIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 18, 2003

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the long-overdue energy conference report, while at the same time sharing my disappointment with the process by which the House leadership has brought this legislation to the floor.

As we all know, one of the greatest problems facing the United States today is our lack of national energy independence. The United States' dependence upon foreign sources of oil is simply unacceptable for a country rich in natural resources and equipped with the capability to develop these resources as a means of increasing our national security. At the height of the energy crisis during the 1970s, the United States imported 46 percent of our oil supply. Today, it is estimated that we import approximately 55 percent of all energy used in this country. As America's energy consumption increases, our need to produce more energy rises as well. Unfortunately, supply is not meeting demand, and our increased reliance on foreign sources of energy has potentially disastrous consequences for our economy and national security. The energy conference report contains significant incentives for the exploration and production of oil and gas and represents an important step toward increasing our national energy independence.

At the same time, energy independence cannot be attained through production alone. Though Congress should strongly encourage the production of energy sources such as oil, gas, and nuclear power, Congress should also incentivize businesses and consumers to produce energy with wind and solar power and conserve energy through innovative technologies.

When used effectively, the Internal Revenue Code ["the Code"] can help to stimulate both the production and conservation of energy. Provisions in the Code such as section 29 and section 45 have stimulated the production of nonconventional fuels and wind energy, respectively, and the tax title of the energy conference report will extend these credits and encourage continued production from these sources for years to come.

Further, the report's funding authorizations and tax incentives for investment in clean coal technology will benefit both consumers and the environment in the state of Texas. Texas consumes more coal for electricity generation than any other state in the country, with a significant amount of that coal mined in Texas. Unfortunately, while generation facilities must burn coal to provide the electricity that so many people take for granted, burning coal inevitably releases some pollutants into our atmosphere. Together with private industry, the Department of Energy's clean coal technology program is working to develop cleaner-burning technologies that will decrease emissions of nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, and other airborne pollutants.

Additionally, I am pleased that the conference report seeks to decrease our over-reliance on foreign sources of oil by repealing the current sunsets for the qualified electric vehicle credit and clean fuel vehicles deductions. Further, I appreciate the inclusion of a credit for the purchase of hydrogen fuel cell motor vehicles. I included a similar provision in my energy tax legislation, H.R. 1436, the Energy Independence and Security Act, and believe strongly that fuel cell technology holds enormous potential for the future. The federal government has an important role to play in the development and use of this clean, renewable energy source.

Any balanced energy plan must acknowledge that Americans need to increase our conservation efforts in an attempt to move closer to energy independence. To that end, I appreciate the inclusion of incentives to homeowners to make energy efficient home improvements that decrease their consumption of energy.

As well, the energy conference report's increased funding authorization for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP] will directly benefit low-income Texans in my district who rely on LIHEAP aid to pay their utility bills. Last year, Texans received \$50.1 million through this federal grant program, and this legislation should increase the amount of federal aid that Texas receives in the future.

Further, I believe that the electricity provisions contained within the conference report will encourage the improvement of our country's transmission infrastructure by reducing the depreciable lives for transmission assets from twenty to fifteen years. Accelerating the depreciation period will provide additional resources for electric utilities to modernize their transmission systems, which should increase the reliability, safety, and security of the national grid system.

I am, however, extremely disappointed with the process by which the Republican leadership has brought this measure to the floor. It is well known by now that the Republican leadership and energy conferees in both Houses drafted the conference report without Democratic participation. Democratic legislators who, in some cases, have been involved in drafting complex energy legislation for several decades were prohibited from taking part in this process. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans' behavior throughout this process has been outrageous and inexcusable, and their actions demonstrate a contempt both for the democratic process and the constituents of the legislators who have been denied a voice over the past several months.

SUPPORTING POISON PREVENTION
AND CONTROL CENTERS

HON. RAHM EMANUEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 21, 2003

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 686, which strengthens poison prevention in America and guarantees funding for our nation's 74 poison control, information and treatment centers. Each year these centers save countless lives, and it is critical that we ensure the financial stability

and public awareness they need to best serve the American people.

As our nation's primary line of defense against poison-related injuries and deaths, these centers provide physicians and the general public with direct access to life-saving information. Health care professionals rely on these centers for immediate, around-the-clock assessments and treatment recommendations for many types of poisonings, overdoses and drug interactions affecting people of all ages. Parents who find their child has consumed a toxic substance can receive immediate professional help with one phone call, any time, day or night.

Over 90 percent of all accidental poisonings take place in the home. More than 50 percent of these accidents involve children under the age of six, with more than one million young children exposed to toxins annually. When a child's life is potentially in danger, parents need to know immediately where to go for help. Too often parents are unaware of the services provided by poison control centers and turn to costly and time-consuming options such as rushing to emergency rooms at distant hospitals. In response to this situation, this bill provides for both a nationwide toll free number connected to local poison control centers, and a new media campaign to call the public's attention to services available through this number.

My home state of Illinois is served by the nation's oldest poison control, information and treatment center, the Illinois Poison Center. The IPC has expertly served the needs of metropolitan Chicago since 1953, and handles approximately 100,000 cases throughout the state of Illinois each year. In 1985, my state was served by five regional poison control centers, but only IPC remains after deep budget cuts over the years. We must ensure that our nation's remaining centers receive the support they need to continue serving the public.

Our nation's Poison Control and Information Centers also play a vital role in managing public health crises, environmental disasters, and the threat of weapons of mass destruction. In July of 2000, the Illinois Poison Center was the first to respond to a nitric acid leak at a Chicago factory. In December of that same year, the IPC was again the first to respond, this time to an anthrax threat at the British-American Chamber of Commerce in Chicago. And, in August of 2001, the IPC responded to a toxic chemical spill on the Dan Ryan Expressway.

The Illinois Poison Center has developed protocols for response and notification of proper governmental agencies when these events occur, and it is also a participant in regional disaster drills throughout the metropolitan Chicago area. Poison control and information centers like the IPC are a critical part of our nation's emergency response and disaster preparedness systems.

Poison centers represent a cost effective investment that benefits the public health. In 1998, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services estimated that every dollar spent on a poison center saves seven dollars in unnecessary medical costs.

Mr. Speaker, I commend our colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their hard work on this legislation. This bill is good for the health, safety and security of the American people. I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote for S. 686.